ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM—TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE NOTES

DATE: Thursday, August 30, 2018
TIME: 9:00AM to 4:00PM
LOCATION: California State University, Sacramento—Modoc Hall Willow Suites

Attendees: Adam Fukushima, Andrew Baier, Anja Aulenbacher, April Nitsos, Claire Fliesler, Craig Davis, Deborah Turner, Emily Abrahams, Emily Heard, Erika Whitcomb, Esther Postiglione, Jacob Lieb, Jaime Espinoza, Jeanie Ward-Waller, Jeanne LePage, Jerry Barton, Jesse Gothan, Jim Townsend, Jonathan Matz, Keith Williams, Kendee Vance, Kevan Sharizadeh, Laura Cohen, Luke McNeel-Caird, Lyndsey Nolan, Marc Mattox, Mark Samuelson, Marsie Gutierrez, Matt Turner, Melanie Mullis, Natalie Bee, Oona Smith, Richard Rendon, Rye Baerg, Scott Lanphier, Stephanie Olarte, Tamy Quigley, Ted Davini, Teresa McWilliam, Tracy Coan, Victoria Custodio
By Phone: Rob Chavez, Kevin Jensen, & Edward Frondoso

TIME	TOPIC	SPEAKER
9:00	Welcome, Introductions, and Opening Remarks Tamy Quigley welcomed new participants. She and April Nitsos have been looking to balance the org chart, and they managed to include several new members. They are still hoping to fill a few gaps. April had the new participants introduce themselves and their organizations.	April Nitsos / Tamy Quigley
9:15	Caltrans Update / Organization Chart We just closed Cycle 4. We had a lot of applications. Mary Hartegan said a number weren't successfully submitted both online and hard copy, so they provided technical assistance. They got 550 applications. The system has some glitches, so IT is working so we can ascertain the actual amounts, hopefully by the end of next week. The hard copies haven't yet been logged or posted. Caltrans headquarters and the districts are reviewing applications for high-level eligibility, schedules and projects looking deliverable, and other major issues. They deliver that info to the CTC. That will take about two weeks, and they will give comments. We're into the fourth reporting cycle. Semiannual reporting became quarterly with SB1. Please let agencies know this. We'll receive reports on September 5. We're also receiving completion reports. We have seventy-three. Those are what	April Nitsos / Tamy Quigley Ted Davini / Emily Abrahams / Teresa McWilliam

	used to be our final delivery report, due within a year of the project becoming operable or contractor acceptance. This tells us the true cost and schedule. This has changed. Now it's due within six months, with the same information, and there's an additional final delivery report due 180 days after project closeout. We're going to make the completion report form the final delivery report form. Ted Davini said the five different applications in one was tricky for the submittal process, and IT is doing a great job. He would ask the group to, in spring, focus on what the next application will look like. We have to get ahead of it if we are going to be able to incorporate electronic reviews. In cycle 4, IT didn't get the application changes until late in the process, so IT got behind in the end, not by their own fault. We need to be more proactive. April Nitsos agreed. IT did an amazing job getting the application out. It was our second step in trying to automate these applications. The first was creating multiple applications.	
9:45	CTC Update Anja Aulenbacher said the Legislative Analysts Office is analyzing the ATP. They've given them a history of the program and given them documentation and a review of the processes. Their next step is to do some site visits. They've been in contact with MTC to talk about some projects they could visit. We're still getting a fair number of requests for scope changes. The major scope change on the August commission agenda was approved. The scope change was successful because it was a great partnership among organizations, and we received letters of support from local advocates. There was collaboration and support and site visits and the city's willingness to partner. This scope change was an example of a positive outcome, but it took ten months, and it's not a quick process, and it took a lot of work. Laurie Waters asked Anja to discuss time extensions. We still get a lot of these, but they're slowing down. Less than half of the phases receive time extensions. It's probably	Anja Aulenbacher

	about 20% per fiscal year. One trend is that a lot of time extensions involve a domino effect. They are putting their annual report together. No legislative recommendations. A draft will be released to the commission in October. Anja introduced Andrew Baler, their newest intern. He has been very helpful. April Nitsos said the scope change Anja mentioned was a huge effort. There are more in the pipeline. There are between ten and twenty scope changes coming up. They're not all major. If you have a scope change, the agency must contact their district. The district will let them know if it's considered minor. Changes affecting the benefit of the program are major. The one Anja discussed was major. We hadn't had many up to that point. Caltrans and CTC were working to figure out what the criteria are to accept or reject them. Let agencies know we're still looking at many months to get scope changes accepted (or not). This can impact project delivery. Ted Davini said the issue with the Pico project involved a major river. They had a bike route on both sides but few crossings. The application was presented as a bridge between two roadway structures connecting the bike routes. The change was to shift the bridge much closer to one of the roadways. But they made it more palatable by improving other aspects of the project. So the application maintained similar levels of the original benefits. On another project they thought they had fifty-five feet of roadway, but their roadway was only forty feet wide, so the project had to become a class III bike lane which is a major scope change. A minor change might mean someone realized their project wouldn't cost as much so they want to embellish it. Jeanie Ward-Waller asked about time extensions. Are they still being held to their other timelines? Yes, so a time extension usually means adding time extensions for multiple phases. Jaime Espinoza said there's a reason for this. You don't know what the future holds for later phases. Because you could end up having another future delay on top of that. So that's why we deal with one at a time.	

	Claire Fliesler asked where in the process and schedule for local agencies are preaward site visits for projects over $10 million? April said they're still working on that. The language is more that we "can" visit, not that we "must." We've asked CTC staff to look at having evaluators look at those higher cost ones first, so we can get a gauge on if there are concerns requiring a site visit. Anja said the evaluation process is now through October 8. Site visits would then likely occur between now and October 1.	
10:00	ATP Delivery Report Jaime Espinoza shared a PowerPoint presentation. He shared some common timelines for development phases (from the allocation to when they complete it). We see a lot of projects not allow enough time in their initial phases. You can identify future roadblocks by walking it with a specialist. This helps prevent delays. Luke McNeel-Caird thinks a lot of local agencies don't realize how the timelines work. Jaime said there is a state schedule. There is a two-month period to get it through the checks. These time frames on the PowerPoint don't account for the preparation schedule. Some of these phases can be done concurrently. April Nitsos said we could add another sheet that includes the CTC process so it's clearer. Melanie Mullis agreed with the idea of telling applicants about the CTC schedule. But the application was clear and gave you the CTC time period. That was helpful. So, once you complete these phases, you move on to construction. You have six months to get that into contract. You can ask for more time up front. Some projects require more if they're larger. Kendee Vance asked, what constitutes unforeseen? Jaime said it was if they walked the project and they knew there	Jaime Espinoza

	was a historical district and you account for that. But once you get through that, you discover that not only do you have historical issues, you also have archeological issues and must do another environmental study. Jesse Gothan said they were putting in a pole for a signal, and they didn't anticipate a cultural study. They thought it was a built environment. Another example would be if they put something out to bid and there's a bid protest. Jaime said a delay to your contract award would be another example. He shared slides of the program cycles/fiscal year. All actions are accounted for for Cycle 1, allocated at 97%. Cycle 2 is 36%, but we are trending to get 99%. Cycle 3 is trending at 13%. Luke thanked Jaime for the information. He asked what happens to the lapsed funding. Jaime said his understanding is that the funds that are lost or lapsed revert back to the state highway account, not the program. SB1 language, however, has it revert back to the program. Our current projects have mixed funding, so that accounting will be interesting for someone. He is not entirely certain. April said she has heard the money goes back to the program and it's used for project advances. She believes Jaime's table includes advances. He has a more detailed report that could be made available. Anja Aulenbacher said they are working with the budgets department to see what the status of the lapsed money is. She does not yet know. Jaime said the lapsed funds represent either lapsed projects that will never be completed or (more commonly) projects that lapse certain phases. The projects remained active, but they paid for the right-of-ways out of their own pockets. Very few actual projects lapsed. Esther Rivera asked if we have information on those lapsed projects. One agency walked away from the project. One agency experienced weather hardship that deteriorated the roadways and made the project impossible. Jaime said Cycle 2 is still active. FY 16–17 is currently at 93%, and everything red is in a time extension. FY 17–18 is	

	the same. We have allocated 5% for FY 18–19. Cycle 3A is the augmented projects due to SB1. FY 17–18 is 38% and FY 18–19 is 4%. Esther asked about the $223,000 of SB1 funds that lapsed in 3A. They'll return to the program. April noted that not all funding was SB1. The 17–18 year was all SB1, but future ones aren't necessarily funded by it. The chart of time extensions shows the phases they occurred in. Construction accounted for the vast majority, and it was alarming. Once you factor in that it was a new program and new agencies and a lot of money in two fiscal years to deliver. Even within these, we still had an allocation rate of 97%, which is phenomenal for a brand-new program. Luke asked if he knows a percentage of projects that didn't include a time extension. Jaime can bring that information. But 70% of the phases didn't require extensions, which is pretty good. April added that this was really less than two years, maybe more like twenty months. These graphs reflect data through the August CTC meeting. Cycle 2 is at 18% of phases have needed extensions. The number of projects decreased, but the number of phases went up. Cycle 2 had three years, so they hope that the number of extensions drop. Cycle 3A only had one fiscal year, and 16% requested extensions. Again, phases are granted extensions individually. If you ask for an extension for design because you had environmental delays, and you request twelve months, then you wouldn't be able to request another extension if you had a different delay. You're allowed one extension per phase, by the guidelines. Each phase can have its own unique reasons for delays. They can all be impacted by an environmental delay, but if in Phase 2, you've already asked for a time extension, you can't request another if you have a hang-up in the next phase. Ted Davini followed up on other comments and said that he sees the benefits for the program to just adjust the whole schedule as part of early-phase time extensions.	

	Anja said the CTC reaffirmed their Timely Use of Funds. They will not be making changes. The write-up they must do for each extension allows for the fact that there may not have been a new delay. It's a competitive program, and evaluators look at deliverability. The evaluators trust what agencies submit on their applications. It affects the score. We need to keep in mind that we want to stay as true to what was promised as possible. Things do come up, but we have to balance that. Melanie Mullis asked, what percentage of extensions are due to a lack of due diligence? Does that happen a lot? Jaime said, yes, that does happen. Sometimes you can tell from the application. He doesn't know the percentage, but it's common. Claire said she sees unrealistic expectations for engineering estimates. Are you seeing a lot of that? Jaime said, yes, that has happened. Has there been a discussion of using lapsed funds for that? The CTC could discuss that. Scott Lanphier asked if all extensions are approved. No, they're not. The passage rate is high, but they don't always get the amount of time they ask for. Sometimes they pad. They work with the agencies to pare it down. Jaime reviews each one with CTC staff and they discuss concerns and reach out to try to get answers. There are instances where they realize the agency has requested too little time again and they still work with them. We don't want them to fail. Jeanie Ward-Waller asked if this happens more with new agencies to the program or disadvantaged agencies. Jaime said several required a master agreement. Some are for agencies who are already familiar with the program—many, even. Natalie Bee said State Parks can do what Claire said and reapply funds when projects come in under budget. But so far, they've been fortunate, and when they ask other agencies if they have cost overruns, they can use that money. But ATP has so many projects it would be hard to make it fair. April said the CTC has been clear about no cost increases. It's in the actual guidelines. That might be a good topic for Cycle 5 workshops.	

	Jaime said we've nearly doubled our program with SB1 funds. Luke asked if there's a comparison to other programs in terms of allocation rate. We've been asked to compare it to other programs. But each program is unique. Cycles 3, 3A, and 3G will all be combined in reporting. What percentage of Cycle 4 applications are noninfrastructure (NI)? We don't know. Oona Smith asked if Cycle 3A money is secure if SB1 is repealed. April said their understanding is that funds that have already been allocated are dedicated to those projects. We can guess about what will happen in November, but we don't know yet, so it's best to just say Caltrans and CTC don't yet what the impact would be in case of repeal. Just keep proceeding. If you hear information from CTC or Caltrans, that's when you can know you are getting correct information, and everyone else is still guessing. Anja said they will continue to follow the law.	
10:30	Mary Hartegan said there were about fifty-three combination projects and 29 standalone NI projects. All ATP projects are considered SB1 projects, but there are different reporting templates. We have federal as well as state funds. They're not quarterly. Reports are due on September 5. The report discusses cost, schedule, a summary of deliverables, and any scope changes. The submit button sends it to our inbox. There are progress report guidelines that she updated this week and a reporting flow chart. The information from these September reports goes to the commission in October. The page also includes a status report, updated weekly. She submitted an SB1 project reporting sheet, and that should be up shortly. The final delivery report is due within 180 days. This will be the template for the completion and the final report. You can just change the check boxes rather than fill out a new form. Tamy Quigley said this is different than the local assistance delivery report. You can use these reports to complete both. April Nitsos said that even if you have SB1 funding, you still use the ATP reports. The guidelines now delineate all projects as both.	Bob Baca / Mary Hartegan / April Nitsos

	Claire Fliesler said your estimated cost will be the same and the schedule. So we just submit the same information? Teresa McWilliam said, isn't there a no-change box? Yes. April said that takes a huge amount less work for staff too. Marsie Rosenberg Gutierrez asked if we need the precounts too. Yes, that's on there, from the application, or six months prior to the start of project. Cycle 1 projects didn't ask for that in the same way, but the narrative section did include it. The timelines stay quarterly until July 2019, and then it's semiannual again. Have people contact Mary Hartegan for any reporting questions, not the local districts because there's so much changing information and procedures. Have anyone who has a question contact her. Jesse Gothan said the reason for it is the SB1 provision for transparency in the program. After the first year, it will be semiannual. Ted Davini said most of future project reports shouldn't change, just an update of percentages and things. And someone else added that for the SB1 report, the percentages go by 25% chunks. April talked about baseline agreements. Are there questions about what is happening with SB1? Jesse said he gets a lot of questions about the cutoff if there is a repeal. April and Anja Aulenbacher said that as we get information, we will share it. There's only speculation at this point. Luke McNeel-Caird asked if there will be information provided about how much money has been collected to date so we know what's in the bank. Anja said they're working to get those numbers. Budgets should have some projections. Marsie was asked if they'd like to speed up their schedule by resubmitting for SB1 augmentation. So, for next time, how will that pan out if funding disappears? April said the baseline agreement is required for any project costing over $25 million or an ask for ATP funds over $10 million. We have four from Cycle 3. The process can be	

	daunting. She cannot stress enough that if you know your agencies have baselines to start early and work with Caltrans to get the info in place. If you don't have the baseline info yet, you may be removed from the program. April said they did their first SB1 workshop last week. It's not a long workshop. They talked about reporting and baseline agreements and the programs. The next workshop is next week in San Luis Obispo (District 5), and you can go on the SB1 blog for future dates. These will be recorded and put online on the SB1 intranet and internet. Info will go out through the listserv. Emily Heard had a hard time getting signed up with the listserv.	
	Presentation of Criminal Near Misses Using Objective Video Evidence Showing Safety Concerns for ATP Project Areas Craig Davis and Matt Turner shared data for understanding the barriers for mode shifts. They showed a video of multiple assaults by drivers upon bicycle users. There used to be ridiculous barriers to prosecution. CHP wouldn't prosecute for fear of "opening a can of worms." They said they would have to pass a bill. So they worked with legal, and now CHP does not have to "on view" to accept video evidence. Before the one where the driver purposely braked, no one had charged and prosecuted assault and reckless driving against a cycle. It used to require a collision. But community outcry and then the mayor managed to get a charge of felony assault. They are securing California legal precedents using cyclist video evidence in Alameda County. They are working with CHP and the sheriff's office to sensitize officers to cyclists. They had a conference on the impact of near misses and perceived risk on cyclists. They brought in diverse stakeholders, including bike shop owners, CHP, Caltrans, etc. They brought a town hall series out, including district attorneys, sheriffs, and more. One thing that came out was the Alameda DA says positive identification is not required. You can use lots of evidence to figure out who it was.	Craig Davis / Matt Turner

	Now they're mobilizing cyclists with cameras to execute a broad public awareness campaign. We need education on using cameras, submitting incident reports, and working with law enforcement. Their incident management system can track these data. We need criminal near-miss data for safety. It's the best measurement of the major barrier to mode shift. Near misses and perceived risk are the top reasons people stop biking or won't bike. Near misses are far more common than collisions. ATP rubrics only ask for actual collisions. This is a lagging indicator. Criminal near-miss data helps municipalities, law enforcement, and cyclists. These data help us capture how people are feeling. We have a description from the man whose arm got hit, video evidence, and the law enforcement data. It also captures how it made him feel. Perception drives behaviors. The inclusion of this in safety scoring would encourage applicants to seek out these data. This would help people identify areas of risk and repeat offenders. This doesn't require deaths before a bike lane is created. By the time someone has been hit, the area has been dangerous for a while. There's not much awareness about not requiring positive identification or "on view." This is an important step. Kevan Shafizadeh said they did a study on campus, partnering with other universities, and one possible suggestion could be we know the ATP application process uses the TIMS database, and getting it into that would help funnel it in. TIMS uses CHP reports, and it goes through that vetting process. How are these data verified and vetted? Getting direct information from cyclists is better than making it go through the police. You can filter just based on law enforcement reports. There is an underreporting of collisions. Integrating databases is a challenge.	

	Claire Fliesler said right now we're all using apples to apples. Having communities with no near-miss data (especially disadvantaged communities) would make the playing field uneven. In Alameda County, we had a camera subsidy program. You don't need everyone to have a camera. If you begin getting some data and having law enforcement accept it, it's a process to begin. This objective data is similar to how smartphone videos have transformed law enforcement. Cell phones can be used too. Anyone can capture this data. Most people do have those. Erika Whitcomb said her question was similar: how much is this being implemented in low-income communities? And how does this apply to pedestrians too? It's easy to mount a camera on a bicycle. So, these data are specific to bikes. But this could encourage pedestrians to video incidents. This system is specific to cyclists. Matt said for pedestrians, you can also use footage from convenience stores, dash cams, etc. They've used this in the poorest areas of the county. We're doing this with no money and little time, but it's expanding. This is a chance to incentivize people across the state to seek out this data. Esther Rivera echoed concerns about camera cost and people's concerns about being videoed. UC Berkeley has been working on Street Story, a crowd-sourcing of data. It gets at that community level without video. In terms of law enforcement, some specific parts of a city won't have that data. Law enforcement and communities of color don't have a great relationship. Craig said we have a diverse population in California. We'd like to see this in all communities. There are cheaper cameras. With a subsidy program, that can help. All you need is funding. Cost can be addressed. The video we are getting is not of the user—it's of the criminal. This is for their own personal safety. Objective video evidence is helpful for making things better.	

	The town hall participants included new players, and the sheriffs said, we want video evidence and we will act on it. It's an education process for cyclists, law enforcement, Lyndsey Nolan echoed the concern about law enforcement barriers and cost. Mark Mattox liked people being held accountable for reckless behavior, but it's hard to incorporate into a competitive program. This might exacerbate the gaps with disadvantaged communities. Matt said if people knew about the program and that this data was valuable, they would make it easier to get the data. Free cameras and things like that. If they knew it was a point of data that had value, people would seek it. Without understanding what the threats are, it's a much harder climb. Nobody is meeting their mode-shift targets. At the town hall, about 90% of the audience was senior cyclists, and in this case, they still wanted this. Keith Williams said they talked about local agencies working with communities who might have cameras. Maybe cameras could be registered with the ATRC and then they would have that data and they would know where the pockets are with no cameras. Those would be the communities that could be invested in with subsidized cameras.	
1:00	They got a LOT of interest from potential evaluators. So they put together fifty-one teams of two. There are 102 evaluators. We are giving each evaluator team approximately eleven applications, which they seem to feel is more feasible. There are about thirty alternates. It's been great to see all the enthusiasm. There's a really good representation geographically. There is good rural representation, and there are a lot of new people. They are assessing conflicts of interest. These are the very preliminary Cycle 4 statistics: the trend seems to be with medium infrastructure applications, about 45%. About 20% are large infrastructure over $7 million. About 9% are plans and NI. Just under 30% is small infrastructure. The largest amount is 39.6 million, and the smallest is under a million. We got a lot of small-urban and rural applications. There are a few new applicants. They	Anja Aulenbacher

	started reading applications. The interns have read around a hundred. A lot of applicants did not enter the correct CalEnviroScreen numbers, entering percentages instead of scores. This indicates that applicants need more instructions for this. They will post staff recommendations for statewide and small-urban and rural components in December. Marc Mattox asked if evaluators will receive a mix of types of applications. Anja Aulenbacher said they will get a mix. Large infrastructure has more questions, so they balance out timewise if they are spread out. It's already a feat to get all the applications distributed to the teams based on conflicts, so it would also be hard to try to give a team just one type. Marsie Rosenberg Gutierrez asked what criteria were used to qualify evaluators. They did not accept consultants. They asked that they have some kind of transportation background. Many are planners, engineers, and advocates. If it wasn't obvious to us, we asked them why they were interested and what their qualifications were. Not all had ATP experience, but most did. Claire Fliesler asked if we can ask if evaluators even want hard copies. April Nitsos said the goal is not to have the hard copies, but we do it in case of glitches. We ask for five for all the parties involved. Ted Davini said we have to really lock the application in earlier for there to be time to develop an online-only process. Esther Rivera said it would be good to focus on getting specialized evaluator teams. Anja agreed it would be helpful to get that information earlier, yes, if they have a specialty. They have reviewed different regional DAC definitions, and so many are subjective. Two letters advocated for getting rid of the regional definitions altogether. From the staff point of view, we're information-gathering. We will discuss the regional definitions as part of the Cycle 5 process and the workshops. That could be a good time for a potential change. Here is some context: We started to review the	

	applications, and there are some applicants who use the regional definitions. We've gotten to about a hundred out of five hundred, but the last cycle, there were fifteen applications out of the approximately 460 who used it. The plan is to reassess and hear both sides. Claire said her community is unlivable. They use the regional definition, and they have hardly any areas qualifying under Caltrans adopted standards. The local conditions are important. Melanie Mullis said she pitched the idea that there is a way to address the housing-cost disparity in places like the Bay Area in a more even-keel way, by using survey data available in all communities, looking at housing-cost burden. This evens that out without using a localized definition. Jacob Lieb said we're desirous of having this issue discussed. It's clear to us that what's going on is regions are jockeying for competitive advantage through the definitions. We need to dig into it at the statewide level. Esther agrees with what Jacob said. It's becoming a little too flexible, and the existing conditions are flexible enough. Erika Whitcomb echoed Esther's comments. If it wasn't for some regions' ability to take advantage of the flexibility, we wouldn't be in this situation. We need to be able to show all the communities where the state is picking up. Luke McNeel-Caird said Placer County struggles through multiple cycles because of this DAC criteria. If you don't get the points, you don't get the money. Some pockets of the community are disadvantaged. Local conditions should be considered. It doesn't work for a lot of rural counties. From an RTPA perspective, we're a diverse state, and a lot of MPOs would say even within a county there needs to be consideration. Jesse Gothan seconded those comments. They have also noticed that only DACs get funded. We know it will be worth the ATP investment in those communities. It's a significant investment for them to do an ATP application, and there are a lot of comments about the review process. Two reviewers who haven't been coached or screened are	

	deciding about a large investment. Has there been discussion about what can be done to improve the review process, so it doesn't feel so arbitrary? Anja said the evaluators are coached and trained. They let some go who did not commit to that. They are asked to put in time to learn about the program and process. They go through the scoring rubrics with them. Some trainings go longer than four hours. By the end of those trainings, they are very familiar with the evaluators and their backgrounds, and she is confident that all 102 evaluators have been very involved in ATP or they are the active transportation for their agency. It is not arbitrary. They understand the investment. CTC staff also reviews and scores, and if there is a discrepancy, those are discussed. We do care about each project and each score. When people participate as evaluators, too, that helps their understanding of the process, so it can help jurisdictions wanting to apply. April thanked Anja for her explanation. A lot of people may not understand the trouble CTC goes to to properly select applications. Could there be something on the website to let people in on the process? Melanie asked if the teams are set up strategically. Yes, normally one from the north and one from the south. There are usually Caltrans staff divided up. Kendee Vance really appreciates the process, but she has had to advocate for the goals of the program through the evaluation. If evaluators don't understand that it's about the application, not the project, then it doesn't work well. That needs to be consistently shared. If you're going to have so many applicants, it's critical. We have to invest as much effort into evaluation as the applicant did into submittal. Oona said we'll grapple with this for the length of this program. One project that she kept coming back to was a safety project. Stellar application for a redundant rec trail. Kendee said, yes, it needs to meet the program goals first and then look at the application. Anja said they tell evaluators they need to stick to the specific scoring rubrics. The rubric is meant to reflect the goals of the program.	

	Rye Baerg said some cities have the money to put together a great application, but they're not disadvantaged. The rubrics do a good job, and we do also have to consider the project quality as well as the application quality.	
2:00	Presentation on Mode Share Action Plan What is sustainability for the department? They've created the Mode Share Action Plan. She shared a PowerPoint. She shared the statewide bicycle and pedestrian plan, which is the first such plan in the state and also focuses on equity and facilities for all ages and abilities. There are sixty actions, prioritized, for Caltrans and its partners. The Mode Share Plan was adopted in March 2018. The goal is to focus on Caltrans's activities in the near term. It identifies thirty-eight activities. SHOPP is one of the biggest components. How does Caltrans build bike and ped facilities through SHOPP? Some is clarification for what is eligible. They're doing serious work on focusing on areas with hot spots of injuries and casualties, doing a systemic analysis, determining what the characteristics of dangerous roadways are. Claire Fliesler said they tell cyclists to avoid their main street because of danger, so how do we highlight the dangerousness, since it doesn't have much collision data (because they warn people away)? Jeanie Ward-Waller said that is definitely part of the safety program, identifying systemic safety issues. It's good to get to know your district bike and ped planners and let them know, so they can figure out the right improvements. The training component is important. She highlighted the Complete Streets Center of Excellence, a new effort. This is about creating an internal Caltrans resource for staff. This identifies Complete Streets champions and networks them with other staff and partners. This will help promote and make Complete Streets a specialized skill. April Nitsos pointed out they've discussed having a Complete Streets training in the ATRC and asked to partner.	Jeanie Ward-Waller

	The executives will really be pushing this out. The district is where the projects happen, so, yes, the idea is having this reach the district level. SHOPP is heavily driven by the primary asset classes right now, and the goal is to help raise up Complete Streets as important assets, so they can be the driver. They're trying to not just add it into projects but also be standalone drivers. Jerry Barton doesn't see maintenance in there, and that's sort of a theme, that Caltrans doesn't want to own ATP facilities along state routes. Jeanie said that's a negation process, so should we work on making a specific policy? Jerry says it's a challenge in their area—they built a Class 1 along a state route, and Caltrans maintains the corridor, but they do not maintain the bike path. It's redundant effort to have them maintain roadways, and the rest has to be separately maintained. Tamy Quigley said this is a huge point of contention in her region. There needs to be clear direction regarding the expectation. There are many districts approaching it differently right now. Jeanie pointed out that it's complex. If there is local money coming to the table, how do you work out shared maintenance? Some districts can't delegate, said Kendee Vance. It's an important conversation. Jeanie will bring it back for discussion. Jesse Gothan said they're in a process of entering an agreement for a sidewalk gap closure, and it seems they will be responsible for maintenance. Jacob Lieb said there needs to be a focus on areas near transit stations. Sometimes the stations are on freeway medians that are anywhere from unpleasant to terrifying. We're not sure how to be effective in taking on that challenge. They butt up against long timelines and operational standards. How do we work together on this? Jeanie said more of her plan is headquarters-level, but that is important. Speed limits are a big issue. Engineering, automated speed enforcement, etc., are being engaged. It's not clear yet what	

	the specific actions will be. There's a lot of work being rolled out with design. Design flexibility is a growing interest. They hope this will encourage local partners and districts to take a different look at roadway design and allowing room for Complete Streets. There's discussion of a design guide to help people determine the right design for the right context. Ideas are being solicited. Erika Whitcomb asked if there is guidance for all kinds of partners about disadvantaged communities, focused on their specific issues? Jeanie would like to hear more about what she thinks would be helpful. Sometimes there's guidance, but people don't know it's there or how to connect with it. Jeanie noted they are currently just studying best practices and then develop stations guidelines. They also welcome input and engagement. Kendee said it's worth planting the seed within this program so that people could capture some before-and-after, so we can make a case stronger statewide for if you built it and train the drivers, it will work better. It doesn't work well to drop it later. It would probably be a worthwhile conversation—what did the speed-zone survey look like before we added parking or landscaping or narrowed the roadway? This will show the impact on drivers. Melanie Mullis said she's going through that right now. She assumed the focus was legislative. Jeanie said it is part of the discussion, but it's not clear yet what the next step will be. This issue is being looked at by the legislature. Matt Turner said in Alameda there is to a lot of room to do traffic calming. You can't lower the speed limit there. The next bucket is planning and research. There is a focus on DACs. It starts with assessment. Where have communities never had access to planning funds? Good planning work leads to better projects. It's a huge effort to do active transportation plans in all districts. We really want local engagement. Claire asked if Caltrans is applying in future cycles. Jeanie said they applied this cycle, but the bigger push is identifying projects going through the SHOPP. They applied for fourteen projects through ATP. There were a lot	

	of local partnerships. This was the first time they applied. Districts had started with forty-eight projects that dropped to thirty-five or thirty-six projects. It went to the executive board. The district directors had to sign the applications. If a local agency wanted Caltrans to submit an application on their behalf on the state highway system, they can do that. Talk to the district, because it will vary by district. Kendee said it isn't the case that just anyone can get California to submit their application on their behalf. Caltrans becomes the implementing agency. The goal is for Caltrans to develop better partnerships with the locals. Ted Davini said going back to the maintenance issue; it seems funny to bring it back to the maintenance. The locals know their main streets the best. There's a weird disconnect. Jeanie said they've started conversation with the division of maintenance, and there isn't a clear role for maintenance yet. And maintenance is an area where they are strapped and overworked, and there is some old-school thinking there. They haven't quite gotten them to agree to that work. Ted said, but are they the gatekeeper of what the state will own? Once we say we own it, by default we maintain it, legally. Jeanie said it's context-sensitive. Do we maintain special paint they want? Decorative lighting? Ted said a key element needs to be basic elements that meet standards. Jerry Barton said when the District 3 ATP plan was designed, it wasn't consistent with what they had in the local county in terms of a state route. There was a SHOPP project in an area where they'd planned Class 2 lanes. Now the guardrail makes it less safe for bicyclists, where they'd wanted it to be safer. When you venture into this, you need to ensure that locals and Caltrans are on the same page in terms of what the facilities need to look like. Oona Smith asked if all of this is infused with considering that we want to prioritize adaptation and resilience projects. Jeanie said no. The longer answer is that there's a different planning effort. Both planning efforts will inform the SHOPP. It all falls under sustainability. Oona said, as that evolves, will there be opportunities? Data collection and evaluation is another bucket. They just entered a contract to buy StreetLight's walk and bike count	

	data. They anonymize the data and tell how people are traveling. It can revolutionize planning. We're the first state to buy this data. The communication and promotion bucket just started forming an advisory committee. They're encouraging their own staff and culture. April asked for Jeanie to keep us updated. Jeanie noted how much Caltrans is doing, many of them new initiatives.	
3:00	ARTC Update Emily Abrahams shared the Noninfrastructure Contacts list on the website. Kendee Vance makes sure people know about the ARTC when she works with them. Jerry Barton did an NI workshop with school staff. It was a really good workshop, though attendance was not high. The ATRC does a webinar most months. You can keep an eye out for topics of interest. These are also recorded. They have contracts with multiple agencies to provide their resources. Emily shared a list of projects and where they are in the process. NI Technical Assistance also does flash trainings. The next one will probably be on reporting. They provide on-call technical assistance. Any community can request a workshop. They are working on developing project fact sheets and success stories. The Local Government Commission provided assistance to five DACs out of twenty-three requests. They also gave training and networking. They completed the ATP TIMS Tool, and it was used in Cycle 4. For the Bike Planning and Design course, there have already been four trainings. The evaluations were good. FHWA Focus Cities trainings also can be offered to other cities, and they are free. They are on bike safety and design and pedestrian safety and design. Keith Williams asked if there's a deadline. Not really, but it usually takes a few	Emily Abrahams

	months. People can email Tracy Coan for more information on this. They're working on getting the count database up and running. They'd also like to develop a statewide methodology. Need assessment was developed and sent out. They're in the early stages of analysis, and that will be presented next time. That will inform future efforts and would like to link it with an action plan. Bike/pedestrian counter loaners are on the horizon. They're researching equipment and logistics. They would like to receive input. Keith asked when that will roll out. It will as soon as it practicable. Rye Baerg noted that LA used EcoCounter. Kevan Shafizadeh noted that one challenge is that cyclists sometimes ride in weird places. She shared what funding they've received and expended or have in contract. She shared a page of plans and visions. Claire Fliesler asked about the existing cost-benefit tool. April Nitsos said there were so many assumptions that it became less valuable. Ted Davini said mode-shift isn't captured in the HSIP B/C Tool. So, we'd like to be cutting-edge on a new ATP B/C Tool. Keith Williams asked if we should wait until the new design guide is released for the trainings. We'll definitely coordinate with the training. April said those efforts are really efforts between different divisions. We reach out to advocacy groups too. If you guys want to be in on those, let Emily know. This is a $10 million effort on this resource center, and she's taking his plan, which was forward thinking, and she's embellishing it and listening, and she pretty much shoulders it by herself as project manager.	
3:30	Future Agenda Items • Rural challenges • Lapsed funds and where they go • Postelection SB1 information	All

	• Jeanie Ward-Waller's updates (including maintenance, district plans) • Any changes in the application (as per Ted Davini) • Street Story (UC Berkeley) • Debrief on the solicitation for Cycle 4 (the process, improvements, what worked well) • Debrief on evaluation process for Cycle 4 in the March meeting • Debrief on the final reports • ATP at a glance • Highlights on the NACTO conference in LA Other topics can be sent to Debbie. Next meetings: December 13, 2018 Thursday, March 21, 2019 Thursday, July 25, 2019 Thursday, September 19, 2019 Thursday, December 5, 2019	
3:45	Closing Remarks Feedback on the meetings can be given to April Nitsos and Tamy Quigley. April thanked Kevan Shafizadeh and Sac State. Tamy reminded participants that if they must send a substitute to please let her and April know.	April Nitsos
4:00	Meeting Adjourned	All